UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI EASTERN DIVISION

SEAN P. DOUGHERTY,)	
Plaintiff,)	
VS.)	Case No. 4:21-cv-01163-MTS
LEIDOS,)	
Defendant.)	

The Court held an on-the-record status conference and heard from the parties on all pending Motions. As the Court detailed on the record,

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendant's Motion To Compel Discovery, Doc. [17], is **GRANTED**. No later than <u>Friday</u>, <u>September 02</u>, <u>2022</u>, Plaintiff must fully respond to Defendant's Interrogatory numbers 1, 3–6, 8–9, 11–13, 15, and 21 and to Defendant's Request for Production numbers 14, 16, 18, 25, 27–29, 31–33, 35–39, 47, and 56. Plaintiff <u>must</u> file a certificate of service with the Court when Plaintiff provides his responses to Defendant, Local Rule 3.02(A) notwithstanding.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that [27] Defendant's Motion To Compel Plaintiff's Appearance at Deposition is **GRANTED** in part and **DENIED** in part. The Court grants the Motion in that Plaintiff is **ORDERED** to appear for a deposition on <u>Friday</u>, <u>September 09</u>, <u>2022</u>. Defendant <u>must</u> send the Notice of Deposition under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 30(b) to Plaintiff and file a copy with the Court, Local Rule 3.02(A) notwithstanding, no later than <u>Wednesday</u>, <u>August 24</u>, <u>2022</u>. The Court denies the Motion's request for costs and fees.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion To Compel Discovery, Doc. [40], is **DENIED**.

The parties must follow all applicable Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules of this District. *See In re Harris*, 277 F. App'x 645 (8th Cir. 2008) (per curiam) (noting "even pro se litigants must comply with court rules and directives" (citing *Soliman v. Johanns*, 412 F.3d 920, 921–22 (8th Cir. 2005))). **The failure to abide by applicable Rules and this Order will result in the dismissal of this case or in sanctions.**

Dated this 10th day of August, 2022.

MATTHEW T. SCHELP

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE